Appeal: 09-6433 Doc: 32 Filed: 06/29/2010 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6433

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHARLES MONTEZE HARMER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:03-cr-00216-CCB-1)

Submitted: June 24, 2010 Decided: June 29, 2010

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles Monteze Harmer, Appellant Pro Se. Angela R. White, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles Monteze Harmer seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2010) motion. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Harmer has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

Appeal: 09-6433 Doc: 32 Filed: 06/29/2010 Pg: 3 of 3

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED